

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 17-23, 25-29 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 3, 10, and 19-21 are independent.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 12, 17-23, 25, 26, 28, and 29 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Statement of Substance of the Interview

The Examiner is thanked for conducting the interview on July 23, 2010. Claims have been amended by taking into account results of the interview.

During the interview, the Applicant's representative explained what the Applicant had intended by the claimed "...displays images respectively indicating at least one room, in which a size of each image becomes larger..."

The Examiner stated that he was concerned that the word "indicating" does not make clear what the "images" show. The Examiner also stated that because "indicating" at least one room does not necessarily mean that the image is of a room, the claimed "size of each image" does not necessarily define a room.

The Examiner expressed that this same concern applies as well to claim 26. In addition with respect to claim 26, the Examiner stated that the claimed "average of the degree of reception for the transmission devices in each respective room" can be interpreted as the average of degree of reception for all transmission devices, since the transmission devices are in each room.

In conclusion, the Examiner stated that he believes that the cited references are his best references, and that by amending the claims to clarify the intended features, as discussed during the interview, the claims should be sufficient to overcome the rejection.

Subsequently, Applicant has amended claims by taking into account comments made by the Examiner during the interview.

Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of the certified priority document.

Drawings

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that the drawings are accepted.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 22, 23, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 22, 23, and 25 have been amended. This rejection is respectfully traversed based on the claims as amended.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Applicant submits that the present specification specifically describes storage medium for storing the program, none of which are propagating signals *per se* (specification at page 39, line 16, to page 40, line 8).

In order to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 22, 23, and 25 to explicitly recite "computer readable non-transitory storage medium."

Applicant requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-7, 10-14, 17-23, and 25-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,883,621 (Iwamura) in view of U.S. Application Publication 2003/0080992 (Haines), U.S. Patent 6,987,847 (Murphy), and U.S. Application Publication 2002/0018057 (Sano;). This rejection is respectfully traversed based on claims as amended.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

According to a disclosed example embodiment of the present specification (Fig. 6), reception quality Ra 1, Ra 2, Rb 1, Rb 2, Rc 1, and Rc 2 of the transmitters A-1, A-2, B-1, B-2, C-1, C-2 are obtained and average reception quality of transmitters existing in the rooms A, B,

and C are obtained. (specification at paragraph bridging pages 33-34). Further, the specification discloses that “the size of display frames for indicating rooms A, B, and C are obtained from the obtained average reception quality Ra, Rb, and Rc (S 102).” (specification at page 34, first paragraph).

Based on this disclosure, claims 1, 3, 10, and 19-21 have been amended to explicitly recite that the subject being displayed is a “frame.” Claims have also been amended to define frames in terms of enclosing transmission devices contained in a respective room.

Applicant submits that the claims as amended are patentable over Iwamura, Haines, Murphy, and Sano.

The Office Action relies on Sano for teaching the feature that the size of each image becomes larger as the degree of reception...becomes greater.

Sano discloses a display for a display terminal by which a user can easily determine a location at which multi-pass interference is low and the reception quality level is high. Sano discloses that the reception quality can be displayed as a bar graph, and can be displayed as other types of graphs (para. [0073]). Sano discloses that the display terminal includes a movement discrimination section 71 (Fig. 4), or alternatively a reception quality supervision system 77 (Fig. 7).

Applicant submits that the bar graph of Sano shows change in quality level over time of a display terminal. Applicant submits that Sano does not disclose display of a bar graph for other devices in the LAN.

Also, the embodiment of the display terminal of Fig. 4 in Sano pertains to detection of movement of the display terminal. A variation pattern discrimination section 74 outputs a signal which turns on the display of the reception quality level indicator. The determination of the variation pattern of bit error rates requires that a plurality of bit error rates for a plurality of unit times be stored in memory for comparison. (Sano at para. 0066).

The Office Action further indicates that,

“Murphy teaches that communication devices may be labeled in order to indicate at least one room (col. 6, ll. 53-67: e.g., “computer-in-bedroom”).”

Also, in an earlier Office Action, the Examiner had made reference to “Computer Room” in Fig. 6 of Fuji.

Applicant submits that Murphy merely teaches a “label” in order to indicate a location. Applicant submits that the claims require “images” that indicate at least one room, not labels that indicate that images are rooms.

At least for these reasons, Applicant submits that Sano in combination with Iwamura, Haines, and Murphy fail to teach that “the display means displays an image of a frame of the at least one room, in which for each room the respective frame encloses one or more transmission devices that are contained in the room, in which a size of each image becomes larger as the degree of reception detected by the reception degree detection means of signals received from the transmission devices in the respective room becomes greater.”

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact **Robert W. Downs**, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: July 29, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Down #48222
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Down*
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000